Malawi - Conservation Agriculture

Report generated on: January 11, 2016

Visit our data catalog at: https://data.mcc.gov/evaluations/index.php

Overview

Identification

COUNTRY
Malawi

EVALUATION TITLE
Conservation Agriculture

EVALUATION TYPE
Independent Impact Evaluation

ID NUMBER
DDI-MCC-MWI-IPA-AG-2009-v01

Version

VERSION DESCRIPTION
Anonymized dataset for public distribution

Overview

ABSTRACT
The randomized control trial impact evaluation tests different strategies for communicating information about agricultural technologies to smallholder maize farmers in 8 districts in Malawi. The objective is to provide information to the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security as to how best to use its limited resources to increase rates of adoption of new technologies. There are four primary dimensions to the evaluation: agricultural technologies, communication methods, incentives and gender.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY
Randomization

UNITS OF ANALYSIS
Households

KIND OF DATA
Sample survey data [ssd]

TOPICS

Topic	Vocabulary	URI
Agriculture and Irrigation	MCC Sector	
Gender		

KEYWORDS
Malawi, Sustainability, Capacity building, Food security

Coverage

GEOGRAPHIC COVERAGE
12 districts were included in the Agricultural Development Program and Support Project (ADP-SP) in 2009-2010. Together, these districts cover the major agro-ecological zones of Malawi and are spread through the South, Central, and Northern regions.

Producers and Sponsors

PRIMARY INVESTIGATOR(S)

Name	Affiliation
Ariel BenYishay	University of New Souty Wales
A. Mushfiq Mobarak	Yale University

FUNDING

Name	Abbreviation	Role
Millennium Challenge Corporation	MCC	
World Bank Gender and Agriculture Program		
Yale Center for Businesss and Environment		
The Macmillan Center at Yale University		
World Bank Development Impact Evaluation Initiative	DIME	

Metadata Production

METADATA PRODUCED BY

Name	Abbreviation	Affiliation	Role
Millennium Challenge Corporation	MCC		Metadata Entry

DATE OF METADATA PRODUCTION
2014-01-16

DDI DOCUMENT VERSION
Version 1.0 (January 2014). This is the original version of the metadata.

DDI DOCUMENT ID
DDI-MCC-MWI-IPA-AG-2009-v01

MCC Compact and Program

COMPACT OR THRESHOLD
Malawi Compact

PROGRAM
This evaluation provided important information for the development of MCC's investment in natural resource management (NRM) in the upper and middle Shire Region.

MCC SECTOR
Agriculture and Irrigation (Ag & Irr)

PROGRAM LOGIC
The overall objective of the Agricultural Development Program (ADP) is to improve food security and generate agricultural growth through increased productivity of food and cash crops, while ensuring sustainable use of natural resources. The project encompasses three main components which are: (i) institutional development and capacity building, (ii) sustainable food security; and (iii) project coordination

PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS
All districts participating must meet the following criteria: (i) Front line extension staff positions are filled, or acceptable partnerships/outsourcing arrangements are in place; (ii) A Director of Finance is employed by the District Assembly; and (iii) An environmental officer employed in the District Assembly structure or a crop protection officer or land resources officer will be available in the district with a mandate to review the environmental implications o f project work plans. If a district fails to meet any one o f these criteria, it will not participate in the programme. Endeavours will be made to assure that all districts in the country meet these criteria during the period of project implementation. Within the selected districts, a random selection of farmers in every village will be surveyed and monitored.

Sampling

Sampling Procedure

District Selection:

Of the 12 districts scheduled to be included in the ADP-SP in 2009-10, 8 were chosen as evaluation sites. Four are dry districts where pit planting is relevant: Balaka, Chikwawa, Neno, and Rumphi. Composting was promoted in the other four districts: Dedza, Mchinji, Mzimba, and Zomba. Together, these districts cover the major agro-ecological zones of Malawi and are spread through the South, Central, and Northern regions. District selection was not random; rather, it was based on the schedule for ADP-SP and the relevance of the technologies we are interested in.

Selection of Sections and Villages:

From a list of all the sections in the 8 districts staffed by an extension worker, 60 sections were randomly selected from the 4 districts assigned to conservation farming, and 60 sections from the 4 districts assigned to nutrient management. Because there are more districts staffed by AEDOs in the districts assigned to nutrient management, the probabilities of selection are not equal. For the CF districts, we chose 60 out of 176 possible districts. For the NM districts, 60 were chosen out of a possible 281. For each of the 120 selected treatment sections, one village was randomly selected from a list of all villages provided by DAES will provide a list of all the villages in the selected sections. The selection of the villages was weighted by the number of farm families per village.

Randomized Assignment of Evaluation Components:

To evaluate each of the four components of the project, certain subsets of the village were randomly selected for each component. Thus there are four overlapping dimensions:
- Incentives: To address selection bias, sections were allocated to various treatment groups randomly. Of the 120 sections, 60 were randomly assigned to an “incentive” condition. Those selected for the incentive will be offered (but will not necessarily receive) a performance-based incentive.
- Communication Strategies: Next, the type of communication strategy for the section was randomly assigned. 25 are randomly assigned to “extension worker” (AEDO) status, 50 to Lead Farmer (LF) status, and the final 45 to “Peer Farmer” (PF) status. Note that while extension workers continued to be used in all areas (in some cases communicating directly to farmers and in others communicating through peer or lead farmers), the evaluation focused on different communicators (AEDO or LF or PF) in different areas.
- Gender: For the 50 LF villages, the gender of the lead farmer was randomly assigned. 25 LF villages were assigned to male lead farmers (LF-M), and 25 others were assigned to female lead farmers (LF-F).1 Of the 45 PF villages, 22 were randomly assigned to have majority men among the set of peer farmers (PF-M), and the other 23 were randomly assigned to have majority women (PF-F). In other words, we encouraged these villages to choose more peer farmers from the assigned gender rather than the other gender.

Questionnaires

No content available

Data Collection

Data Collection Dates

Start	End	Cycle
2009	2010	Baseline
2010	2010	Midline
2010	2011	Endline

Data Collectors

Name	Abbreviation	Affiliation
Innovation for Poverty Action	IPA	

Data Processing

No content available

Data Appraisal

No content available